

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 30, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 3-5, 7-9, 11 and 15-17 have been amended, claims 1, 2, and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and the title of the invention has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 3-9 and 11-17 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the title of the invention is objected to as not being descriptive. Applicants have amended the title of invention. Accordingly, the objection is overcome. Also, the Office Action objected to claims 3, 5, 7 and 15 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have amended claims 3 and 15 to independent form. Accordingly, the objection is overcome.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicants Related Art (ARA). Claims 1, 2 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the rejection, as applied to these cancelled claims, is rendered moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because ARA fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, ARA fails to teach or suggest a method of fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device “forming array elements on a first substrate, the array elements including field-generating electrodes having a curved shape” as recited in independent claim 3 of the present application.

ARA further fails to teach or suggest an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device including “array elements including field-generating electrode having a curved shape formed on the first substrate” as recited in independent claim 15 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully note FIG. 4B of ARA illustrates “the common electrode 97 and the pixel electrode 98 are shaped in a zigzag pattern” (Specification, paragraph [0016], lines

1-2). Thus, ARA fails to teach “field-generating electrodes having a curved shape” as recited in independent claims 3 and 15 of the present application. As such, ARA fails to anticipate independent claim 3 and its dependent claims 5, 6 and 9, and independent claim 15 and its dependent claims 11-12 and 17. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,977,562, issued to Hirakata et al. (hereafter “Hirakata”); claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,609,255, issued to Leenhouts, et al. (hereafter “Leenhouts”). Applicants traverse the rejection because neither ARA, Hirakata nor Leenhouts, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, ARA, Hirakata and Leenhouts fail to teach or suggest a method of fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device “wherein the rubbing roll has a length corresponding to the short side” as recited in independent claim 3 of the present application.

ARA further fails to teach or suggest an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device “wherein the first and second substrates include first and second cell regions having sizes different from each other and a dummy region, a plurality of first liquid crystal cells are formed in the first cell region and a plurality of second liquid crystal cells are formed in the second cell region such that the plurality of first liquid crystal cells and the plurality of second liquid crystal cells have a rectangular shape, wherein a long side of each first liquid crystal cell is parallel to a first direction and a longer side of each second liquid crystal cell is parallel to one of the first direction and a second direction perpendicular to the first direction” as recited in independent claim 15 of the present application.

Because neither ARA, Hirakata nor Leenhouts teaches or suggests the above features of claims 3 and 15, no combination of ARA, Hirakata, and Leenhouts would provide a method of fabricating and an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having the combined features recited in independent claims 3 and 15 of the present application. Thus, independent

claim 3 and its dependent claim 8 and independent claim 15 and its dependent claims 13, 14 and 16 are allowable over any combination of ARA, Hirakata and Leenhouts.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 30, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

Application No.: 10/824,598
Amendment dated November 30, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated August 30, 2005

Docket No.: 8734.292.00

claim 3 and its dependent claim 8 and independent claim 15 and its dependent claims 13, 14 and 16 are allowable over any combination of ARA, Hirakata and Leenhouts.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 30, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant